

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, March 3, 1958
Room 101, Law Building

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:40 P.M. on Monday, March 3, 1958, in Room 101 of the Law Building. Thirty-four members were present with President Harvill presiding.

Approval of minutes: The minutes of the meeting of February 3, 1958 were approved as distributed to members, with the following change: Fifth paragraph, Constitution - approval of revision: - change last sentence to read: "These amendments provide for two additional members-at-large and the Ex-officio membership of the additional vice presidents."

Honorary Degrees, consideration of: President Harvill explained that Honorary Degrees normally would be a point of consideration but that he would like to have this matter considered at a later time and, accordingly, suggested that the present meeting be recessed rather than adjourned and that honorary degrees be considered on Monday, March 10, at the usual time.

COMMITTEE REPORTS: Student Advisory Program - The Committee on Student Advisory Program, Dr. Hurlbutt, Chairman, was expected to distribute materials to members of the Senate within the next ten days as a preliminary to a report at the April meeting.

Delinquent Scholarship Procedures - Dr. Merritt, Chairman of the Committee to Study Delinquent Scholarship Procedures, distributed a statement for his committee which included a review of questions presented to the committee with Recommendations by the Committee and a statement of Justification for such recommendations. Dr. Merritt read from the report of the committee and these items were discussed as follows:

Question 1 - Review of the policy which denies a student the privilege of establishing credit by any means during a period of disqualification. Students disqualified from the University may not, during the period of disqualification, enroll for work in residence, of course, nor for work in extension. Under certain circumstances they may be given permission to enroll for correspondence course study. They may not, however, transfer to the University any credit completed elsewhere during the period of disqualification. The University likewise does not recognize credit earned at a second institution during a period of disqualification from a first institution, even though the performance of the student grade-wise at a second institution may be used as a basis for acceptance into the University of Arizona. Such students are not later allowed to reestablish such forfeited credit by examination.

Recommendation: That present policy be continued.

Justification: It was felt that disqualification should carry with it the penalty that the student loses, for the period of disqualification, the privilege of establishing any college credit for transfer to the University of Arizona. Our own policy is that students disqualified at another institution are not admissible to the University during the period of disqualification.

Dr. Merritt explained that the committee discussed at length the significance of disqualification and while not wishing to over-emphasize the penalty element, felt that disqualification would be virtually meaningless if the student were allowed to establish credit during this period.

In response to a question by the President, the Registrar stated that institutions generally follow the practice of discouraging the admission of students who are disqualified elsewhere, at least until such time as they are again in good standing. He pointed out that under present policy one of our own students disqualified for scholarship failure may be permitted to enroll in Extension Division with the approval of the Dean of the college concerned and that such credit may be applied on the degree.

Dr. Humphrey questioned the value of an ironclad rule affecting all students and suggested there might be extenuating circumstances where some disqualified students should be allowed to establish credit. To this Dr. Merritt replied that under the present policy a student might conceivably petition for an exception to this restriction.

Question 2 - A review of the present policy whereby a failing grade of 5 received in the freshman or sophomore year is not included in the computation of the graduation grade average, if the course is later repeated in residence and passed. At the time this matter was last discussed in Council it was pointed out that it seems contradictory to forgive failing grades in such instances but not to forgive 4's. University policy in this matter, it was felt, has resulted in considerable abuse. Students doing low work often ask instructors to fail them rather than give them a 4. The course can then be repeated with the new grade being used to figure the graduation grade average, since a failure can be forgiven where a 4 cannot. One suggestion is, for the purpose of computing the graduation average, to permit raising by repeating the course, any freshman or sophomore grade of 2 through 5.

Recommendation: That the policy of allowing students to repeat, for the purpose of raising the graduation average, a course in which a 5 has been received, be discontinued.

Justification: The committee feels that a student's grade average should represent all of his college work. If 5's were not forgiven, a grade average would be a more valid criterion of academic performance. The actual grade average is used for practically all other purposes such as determining eligibility for transfer to another college, reporting grade averages to other institutions, awarding scholarships, determining eligibility for honors, initiation into fraternities and sororities, criteria for obtaining loans, and other similar purposes.

The adoption of this recommendation would eliminate the undesirable practice of students asking for grades lower than the grades actually earned. It would also simplify the computation and reporting of grade averages using IBM equipment.

Dr. Merritt explained that it was the committee's feeling that the grade average for graduation should represent all of the work done by the student. If 5's are not forgiven, the grade average would be a more valid

criterion of academic performance than the average presently used. Actual grade averages, he added, are used for many other purposes, including reports to other institutions, eligibility for honors, the basis for student loans, and eligibility for various activities. He explained that under the present policy many students deliberately ask for the failing grade of 5 rather than the passing grade of 4. The deletion of the policy would eliminate this undesirable practice.

Dr. Nugent argued in favor of the retention of the present policy, pointing out the need of allowing some adjustment in view of the difference in high school and college work. It was his feeling that the present policy of establishing averages might well apply to all fields where an average of students' grades is required. He approved, he said, the present regulation and was in favor of changing it in the other direction, that is to substitute any grade up to the grade of 2 to raise the grade, and count only the grade achieved in the repetition of the course.

Dean Livermore suggested that if any change were made in policy it should be only after the University had announced the change, some two or three years perhaps, before it became effective so that students generally could adjust themselves to a new policy.

In response to a question by the President, Dr. Merritt explained that the committee had no special evidence supporting a change but that the committee based its recommendation solely upon its judgment regarding the general value of the policy. He added, however, that the committee was informed that, in the last graduating class, twenty-five candidates would have been affected by the proposed change.

Dr. Bateman expressed the opinion that many students misunderstood the present ruling and feel that when a course is repeated under the policy no listing is made of the original failure on the student's record. He added that the committee, in considering this also reviewed the possibility of lowering the grade average for graduation as an alternative to the present policy but decided this was not desirable.

Dean Roy explained that in making the original study of this question a special committee found that under the grade point system many institutions disregard the failing grade completely when the course is repeated. This was why the committee in recommending a requirement of the general average rather than a requirement of 80% in units above 4 recommended an average of 3.3 rather than a 3.000. He felt there was a lot to be said for simplification of method. Many students, he added, do not realize that the forgiving of failing grades applies only to the graduation average and are at a loss when they find that all failing grades apply in averages for any other purpose. He moved that action on Question 2 be postponed until a later meeting so that the Senate might review this matter more in detail. No second was heard.

President Harvill explained that it would not be necessary for the Senate to review the whole report today nor to take action on any one or all of its recommendations, but that consideration of the report could be continued at another meeting of the Senate.

Dr. Gegenheimer asked if consideration might not be given to the idea of limiting the waiver of 5's to the freshman year rather than to both the freshman and sophomore years. Dr. Merritt reported that the committee had considered this possibility but it decided not to recommend it. It was Dr. Gegenheimer's thought that failures in the sophomore year are not related to lack of adjustment on the part of the student but indicate factors which suggest ultimate failure in any case.

Mr. Leshar stated he thought it would be in order to consider the effect of the present plan as related to the situation we used to have. Some years ago we had the 80% above 4 requirement under which degree candidates had to offer 80% of the work done in residence above the barely passing grade of 4. The Senate found that many students were graduating with averages of 4 or below and considered this requirement as too low a standard. We then adopted the requirement that the candidate have a grade average of 3.2000 for all work done in residence although the original recommendation of the special committee was for an average of 3.3. Later the Senate modified the standard of 3.2000 by "forgiving" 5's made in the freshman and sophomore years when the course was repeated with credit. Under this policy we have revised our standard of graduation downward to the point where it was under the 80% above 4 rule; although all graduates presumably have an average of 3.2000, many have actual averages considerably below that point by reason of our exclusion of failures in the first two years. This situation is misleading, he said, and fools no one. Last year at least one senior was graduated with 31 units of 5's "forgiven." A more realistic approach, he felt, would be to have the average reflect the student's entire effort and have the adjustment, if one is considered necessary for the first and second year, made in the form of a lower requirement for graduation, such as a 3.3 or even a 3.4 average.

Question 3 - Consideration of modification of the rule which states that a student failing to meet the graduation grade average of 3.2000 can raise this average only by completing additional work in residence. (An example cited was the case of a student who was told he must return to the University to complete in residence any two credit course with the grade of 2. He was told he could not adjust his average by completing a two unit course in an accredited institution in the city where he lived. He returned to the University and completed a two unit course in swimming, earned a good grade, and qualified for his degree.)

Recommendation: That students who could reach the required graduation average by taking one course be allowed to take one 'elective' in residence at another accredited institution if no more than three semester hours of credit are involved and the elective is approved by the dean of the college concerned.

Justification: The committee feels that, in general, present policy is good but that it can lead to rather extreme cases. It is believed that this recommendation contains an adequate safeguard as to quality and would solve some of the problems involved in such cases.

Dr. Merritt explained that the committee felt in general that the policy of requiring work in residence was a good one but it could lead to extremes such as the one cited. The recommendation includes an adequate safe-

guard and the number of hours involved in the adjustment is comparatively small.

Dean Roy said he thought the recommendation was a step in the right direction. He wondered, however, why the committee did not consider inclusion of a course in the major field if this were approved by the major professor. Dr. Merritt replied that the committee had a strong feeling against including any particular course but they took no particular position regarding the selection of the course in the major field.

There was some discussion about the number of units to be involved in the adjustment. There are a few 5-unit courses and an appreciable number of 4-unit courses offered as well as some offerings of greater value. The majority of courses, however, are 3-units in value which explained the committee's recommendation.

Question 4 - Review of the policy which prohibits students from raising their graduation grade averages by completing additional course work through correspondence study through the University. At present the grade average can be adjusted only by completing additional work in residence.

Recommendation: That students who can raise their grade averages to the level required for graduation by taking one course be allowed to take one 'elective' as a correspondence course through the University, if no more than three semester hours of credit are involved and the elective is approved by the dean of the college concerned.

Justification: The reasons here are the same as those given to justify the recommendation in connection with Question 3 above. It is difficult to justify the expense of another semester at the University to a student who needs but one more course. Students report that as much or more effort is involved in completing a correspondence course as is the case when the course is taken in residence.

Dr. Merritt explained that the committee's reasoning in making this adjustment was much the same as for the adjustment in courses in residence. It was Dean Forrester's feeling that the elimination of reference to elective work in Question 3 would be helpful and that it would be well also to provide for work to be done at another institution. Dr. Merritt acknowledged this as a more realistic approach to the problem.

Mr. Leshar asked if the committee had checked with heads of departments regarding the possible inclusion of required courses in the adjustment but found that the committee had not done this. He suggested that department heads might have the feeling that a required course should be done in residence, but Professor Howard, Head of the Department of Business Administration, indicated that the policy should be as flexible as possible and should include both elective and required courses.

Dr. Merritt explained that the recommendation had reference to the general requirement for graduation rather than the scholarship requirement in the major field.

Dr. Patrick remarked that while there might be considerable variation in the meaning of grades among different colleges and universities as well as

among colleges in the University, the present policy allowed control over the grades to be given whereas no control is exercised over grades obtained in other institutions.

Dr. Humphrey suggested that our failure to apply our own correspondence study work on the degree average infers that such work is not up to standard.

Question 5 - Consideration of a proposal that the usual scholarship requirement not apply in the summer session. (The requirement is that a student must pass half of his units, if a freshman; 60% of his units if beyond Freshman level.)

Recommendation: That whatever scholarship policy applies to academic work during a regular semester should also apply to summer session work.

Justification: The committee believes that a scholarship requirement which applies to any university work should apply to all university work. Scholarship committees of the various colleges have been fair in their handling of students who are on probation as the result of summer session work. Very few such students are disqualified. Since students may remove probation status by sufficiently good work in summer classes, it was felt that the University scholarship requirement should also apply to summer session work.

Dr. Merritt explained that the committee considered many arguments pro and con but in general felt that whatever scholarship policy applies to the academic work in the regular session should apply in the summer session. Inasmuch as probation status can be removed by good work, the University scholarship requirement should apply.

At this point Dr. Harvill asked if the committee had considered the possibility of establishing means whereby through administrative action the student's record need not include evidence of probation standing. This status is given frequently to students with limited summer programs whose work during the regular academic year is entirely satisfactory and suggests that the summer failure is not well related to their general attainment. This point had been considered by the committee, Dr. Merritt reported, but it was felt that the University policy should not entirely disregard summer failures.

Dean Lyons explained that in the College of Law they are authorized to consider summer work in evaluating the attainment of the student during the fall semester. This practice, it is felt, enables the college to make a more equitable evaluation of the student's attainment and has been found to be satisfactory in that college.

Professor Bogart raised a question regarding the removal of probation status on the basis of summer work or work in the regular session. It was explained that there is a definite provision for conditions under which probation status is removed. It was later noted in connection with probation standing that on page ninety-one of the catalogue is the statement: "Freshmen students are returned to good standing upon passing more than 50 per cent of their work; students of sophomore, junior, and senior standing are returned to good standing upon passing more than 60 per cent of their work as indicated by the midsemester or final scholarship report next following their placement on probation."

Professor Conley asked if the committee had given any consideration to basing the graduation average on work in the major field only, and Dr. Merritt replied that the committee had not considered this point. It was Professor Conley's feeling that it might be desirable to consider this possibility since it is extremely important that students do well in their field of major interest. It was pointed out that the University, in several of its colleges, does have a higher requirement (3.000) in the major field than the general average requirement for graduation which is 3.2000.

Dean Livermore stated that he was strongly opposed to the present rule and was impressed by Dean Lyons' report of the practice obtaining in the College of Law. He suggested that the summer session work be combined with the preceding semester. The attainment in these combined programs could be considered in connection with probation status, especially for beginning students. He did not feel it good practice, however, to place on probation a student who has enrolled for and failed one summer course after having completed a full year of work with satisfactory attainment.

Dr. Bateman, a member of the committee, explained that they had found this a difficult point to consider but the committee was a little hesitant about using the cumulative effect of summer session work especially in connection with its recommendation regarding the use of grade averages in connection with determining probation status. The committee wishes to remain fairly consistent in its position, he said, although the position of the freshman student was given some emphasis.

Dean Garretson raised a question as to whether the problem might be solved by special action in individual cases rather than having the present rule apply automatically. Dr. Tucker asked if the rule might be applied only when the student is enrolled in excess of a certain number of credits. Dr. Merritt stated that 6 is a normal load and 7 a maximum in the summer session, but that this would not be a major factor in adjusting the problem.

Dean Rhodes suggested that the scholarship committees in the several colleges could submit two different recommendations, one affecting students that might be disqualified and the other affecting students whose special programs would suggest deletion of any record of probation. This latter action could be restricted to students in the summer session.

No action was taken on the foregoing recommendations.

President Harvill expressed appreciation to Dr. Merritt and the members of the committee and indicated that the recommendations would be considered further at the meeting scheduled for Monday, March 10.

Admission Requirements, report re: President Harvill explained that the Board of Regents had asked Dr. Patrick and a representative from each of the other two state institutions to make a report to the Presidents and to the Board of Regents regarding possible adjustment of admission requirements.

Dr. Patrick expressed his feeling that the University now has an opportunity to raise standards of admission substantially and that high schools also have an opportunity to raise the quality of work done. He referred to a crisis occasioned by the progress evidenced by the Russians in science and other fields. They have overtaken us, he said, in science and actually surpassed us in some

other fields. If we are to match brains with the Soviets, he said, it will involve a change in our national mores, and there appears to be sufficient public sentiment developed so that the situation for improvement is encouraging.

He reported that he had met recently in Tempe with Dr. Richardson of Arizona State College of Tempe and Dr. Meister of Arizona State College of Flagstaff. This first meeting was devoted to a rather general exchange of ideas and no member of the special committee came with a prepared program, rather a meeting of minds was sought; but Dr. Patrick stated it was not found. Dr. Richardson, speaking for the State College at Tempe, apparently did not feel any need for changing admission requirements. His position was that we cannot predict college success on the basis of subjects studied in high school. However, Dr. Meister of the State College of Flagstaff was inclined to feel we could make a substantial increase in admission requirements at this time. Both of these representatives showed definite reluctance to having the University act unilaterally in this matter and set up requirements which would not be found in the other institutions.

It was Dr. Patrick's feeling that if the University insists on more rigid entrance requirements it would result in change in requirements listed by the state colleges. He explained that he had consulted with a number of members of the Senate and would advise with others regarding possible changes in policy and he hoped that all members of the Senate would give thought to this matter and if possible submit ideas to him prior to the next meeting of the committee on April 11. No final action will be taken at that meeting but before the University position is made known matters of general policy will be reviewed with the faculty.

Dr. Patrick added that it was doubtful if our present Plan B is necessary. A further item of consideration would be the question of scholarship-requirement in addition to the subject-matter requirement under which students with low rank in the class might be admitted provisionally. Another possibility, he added, is the application of the College Entrance Board type of examinations for admission to institutions of higher education under the direction of the Board of Regents. All of these items are being considered.

President Harvill called attention to a report of a study made of the percentage of students entering the University under Plan A and those entering under Plan B, both from Arizona and from other states. He explained that those entering under Plan B included a larger percentage from Arizona than from outside the state. However, the majority of students entering the University both from Arizona and from other states were admitted under Plan A. The Registrar reported that the percentages were as follow: Of the 724 students in the study from Arizona high schools, 57.6% entered under Plan A, 42.4% under Plan B; of the 612 from out-of-state high schools, 69.8% entered under Plan A, 30.2% under Plan B; of the total of 1,336 students in the study, 63.2% entered under Plan A, 36.8% under Plan B.

He added that under Plan B ten academic credits are required but that the distribution of these credits allows a student more selection than under Plan A which includes only nine academic credits but specifies, in addition to three units of English, one unit each in elementary algebra, plane geometry, laboratory science, social science, and two units in a language.

President Harvill reported that a provision in one of the state statutes indicates that the State Board of Education has the power of setting

requirements for admission to the state institutions; however, he said the privilege of the Board of Regents in this regard is well established and would be upheld were the matter contested. A bill presently before the legislature would give the privilege of specifying admission requirements to the State Board of Education rather than to the Regents.

On motion the Senate voted at 5:35 P.M. to recess until 3:40 P.M. on Monday, March 10, 1958.


C. Zaner Leshner, Secretary